gMorpher Incorporated
PO Box 9
Fort Lee, NJ 07024
LisaWu@gmorpher.com
(201) 682-5757

United States Patent And Trademark Office
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
Attn: Van H. Nguyen, Primary Examiner
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

July 18, 2009

Dear Officer,

Ref. Your Rejection Mailed on 04/29/2009, Application No. 10/604,681

This is our response to your final rejection mailed on 04/29/2009. This response focuses

on discussions of the Prior Art, Chalasani et al. (US 20040103195 A1) cited by your final

rejection. Subsequent responses will address issues (including patentability) raised in your

rejection letter.

The present invention (called INVENTION hereafter) under the above-mentioned patent

application is about invoking Web services by dynamically generating Web-based forms and

client stubs. INVENTION specification [0010-0013] discusses the spectrum of Web Services

technologies. While the Prior Art covers the second category of deployment, INVENTION is on

the third category of service invocation.

Chalasani et al. (US 20040103195 A1)

[Abstract] vs. Claim 1 of the INVENTION

is an autonomic grid on the server side deployment and request processing, which is not

covered by INVENTION. The INVENTION is about automatically generating requests on

the client side and processing responses, which may or may not be returned from an

autonomic grid.

[0024 – 0030], [0025 – 0027] vs. Claims 1, 2 and 4 of the INVENTION

discusses the self-healing and self-optimizing grid among deployed service instances.

Again, the INVENTION is about an automatic client that sends requests to Web service

servers, which may or may not be deployed in a self-healing and self-optimizing grid. Regarding Claim 4 of the invention, the invocation object is generated from client stubs, converted to a SOAP message and sent over to a server, which may or may not be a grid.

[0053] vs. Claims 3 and 6 of the INVENTION

discusses the deployed service is described by WSDL and invoked over SOAP, which is universally true and centering in the whole Web Services open architecture. No sensible patent applications will make patent claims on that. The Prior Art deploys services based on information contained in the WSDL. The INVENTION draws information from the same WSDL from a client perspective, with a different method, mean and step, to construct invocation objects.

[0063 – 0070], [0065 – 0068], [0063 – 0073]

vs. Claims 1, 2 , 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 of the INVENTION

discusses the self-managing grid and coordination of deployed service instances. Again, the INVENTION covers client side Web Services technologies. Server side is transparent to the INVENTION, which is not aware of topology and organizational optimization on the server side. Claims 4 and 5 are about constructing invocation objects on the client side. How the invocation objects are constructed by no means overlaps with technologies utilized by the self-managing grid. Claim 7, 8, 9 and 10 of the INVENTION are about invocation threads on the client side while the Prior Art is about handling them once they reach the grid. Also the Prior Art does not cover visual transformation on the client side.

[0077 – 0070] vs Claim 1 of the INVENTION

discusses the internal working or the grid, which is irrelevant and transparent to the INVENTION.

[0078 – 0084] vs. Claim 3 of the INVENTION

discusses server specific technologies like fail-over and load balancing, which are not covered by the INVENTION.

[Fig. 5-7] vs. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 of the INVENTION

covers service provisioning in the grid which is transparent to service invocation on the client side by the INVENTION.

On Page 7 of your rejection, it reads 'Krueger teaches…'. What's the publication number? On Page 8, 'As to Claim 12' should be 'As to Claim 11'.

The INVENTION expands Web Services innovations on top of prior art. Together, INVENTION and the Prior Art share the fundamental framework of Web Services. However, we innovate in specific areas of the Web Services technology. A deep look at INVENTION does not find any overlapping with the Prior Art.

Please cancel Claims 22 – 33 and advise further actions. Your reconsideration of the INVENTION will be highly appreciated! We at gMorpher Inc are looking forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

/Richard Yates/

Richard Yates, EVP
gMorpher Inc.